



3782/PPW
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 78803.03501
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Patent application of:
Stephen Mulcahy, et al.

Serial No.: 10/509,301

Filed: August 16, 2005

For: IMPROVEMENTS IN AND RELATING TO
CORRUGATED CARDBOARD SUPPORTS

Group Art Unit: 3782

Examiner:
Gary E. Elkins

Charles N. Quinn
Reg. No. 27,223
Fox Rothschild LLP
2000 Market Street, 10th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: 215-299-2135
Fax: 215-299-2150
Email: cquinn@foxrothschild.com
Deposit Account: 50-1943
Customer No. 34,661

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is submitted in response to an official action bearing a mailing date of 19 September 2007 in which the examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-17 as pending in the application, with the rejection and the action being made non-final.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 8 and 16 made under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the

invention and requests reconsideration of those claims both in their form as previously submitted and in their form as amended herein.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11-15 made under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentably obvious when considering the Ringer reference in view of either the Weaver reference or the Forbes, Jr. reference. Applicant requests reconsideration of those claims and of the obviousness rejection thereof, considering both those claims in the form they were presented earlier and in the form those claims have been amended herein.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 11-15 made under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentably obvious when considering the Henry reference in view of the Single reference and either the Weaver reference or the Forbes, Jr. reference. Reconsideration of the registration of those claims as previously presented and as amended herein is respectfully requested.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 10, 16 and 17 as allegedly being unpatentably obvious in view of the Henry reference when considered in light of the Single reference and either the Weaver reference or the Forbes, Jr. reference when further considered in view of either the Rexford reference or the Zimmerman reference. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection of those claims as previously presented and as amended herein.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 10, 16 and 17 as being unpatentably obvious in light of the Ringer reference when considered in view

of either the Weaver or Forbes, Jr. references and further in view of either the Rexford or Zimmerman references. Applicant requests reconsideration of the obviousness rejection of those claims as previously presented and as amended herein, in light of the arguments set forth below respecting the patentability of these claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that when the examiner considers the claims in their amended form as presented herein and the remarks in support of patentability as also presented herein, the examiner will find that the claims are allowable, are unobvious and therefore patentable over the prior art of record. Notification of the same is respectfully solicited.

Please amend this application as follows: